

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
08/929,836	09/15/1997	RUSSELL DONOVAN ARTERBURN	6971	2308
7590 07/30/2004			EXAMINER	
ROBERT D. TOUSLEE			HOFFMANN, JOHN M	
JOHNS MANVILLECORPORATION 10100 WEST UTE AVENUE LITTLETON, CO 80127			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1731	

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$\overline{}$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	08/929,836	ARTERBURN, RUSSELL DONOVAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Hoffmann	1731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 14 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the control of	cation. A proper reply to a chiple ch	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	fthe final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth	in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);	,·	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying t	he
(d) $\square$ they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendmer	nt
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	r reconsideration has been cons	sidered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	$\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ a) $\mathbf{x}$ will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided bek	)□ will be entered and an own or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: 1,3 and 5-7.			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 2, 4, 8-24			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		,	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	•		
10. Other:		John Hoffmann 7-28-0 Primary Experiment Art World: 1731	4

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

**Advisory Action** 

Part of Paper No. 40727

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 008/929,836

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new issue is whether the amendment is proper. It is noted that claim 21is designated as "Previously Presented" however, line 3 has an "a" which is deleted. The new issue is whether there are other improper changes in the amendment.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1)\_ The amendment is not entered and 2) the arguments were not convincing. As to the the portions rejection - it largely irrelevant that the Board did not state the portions were indefinite - the rejection is based on the arguments contained in the rejection. There is no indication that the Board considered whether or not the language was definite - The Board was under no requirement to determine whether that particular language was indefinite. Nothing can be ascertained from the Decision on Appeal as to whether the Board would hold the terms indefinite. Since Applicant did not clearly point out any error in the rejection, it is deemed that Applicant agrees with the arguments in the rejection. As to the argument that Examiner believes the Board agrees with the present rejection: Examiner had no intention of suggesting such and apologizes if that impression was given. Examiners reference to the Decision on Appeal was merely to point out how/why Examiner is unable to tell what is meant by the claims and thus why the present rejection is made.